

APR 05 2007

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 5, 2007. Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 22, 24 to 39, 42 to 50, 52 to 67, 70 to 78, 80 to 95, 98 to 106, 108 to 113, 115, 117 and 119 are in the application. Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank Examiner Tang for her courtesies and thoughtful treatment afforded during an interview conducted by telephone on February 14, 2007. Present at the interview were Examiner Tang and Primary Examiner Larry Donaghue (on behalf of the PTO) and Michael K. O'Neill and Michael Guzniczak (on behalf of the Applicants). Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview follows.

During the interview, the § 103(a) rejection of the independent claims was discussed, and in particular the rejection over European Patent No. 952513 (White) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,068 (Richter) and the background of the invention.

The § 103(a) rejection relied on the background of the invention for disclosure of policy rules that govern how a print queue is created and published.

In regards to this rejection, it was explained that policy rules for a queue are distinct from configuration information for a printing device. In particular, it was pointed out that the information discussed in the background, such as printer IP address and printer type, is configuration information for a printer device, and does not have any impact on how a queue is created and published. Thus, it was explained that the background does not disclose policy rules governing how a print queue is created and published.

Mr. Donaghue responded that in his view, the claims were not sufficiently specific on the meaning of the term "policy rules", such that the PTO was justified in interpreting this term with a small amount of flexibility. For example, Mr. Donaghue felt that page 23 of the specification describes information used in a policy rule for naming the queue which is too similar to information discussed in the background of the invention.

However, Mr. Donaghue did indicate that he would be inclined to more favorably view the application if the independent claims were amended to include the concept of administrative rules for a queue, and specifically to include the subject matter of Claim 23. In his opinion, Claim 23's administrative nature was separate from the broader concept of queue creation, and as such might help to overcome the current rejection.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the system administrator designates a maximum number of printing devices to be supported, and a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number. Correspondingly, dependent Claims 23, 51, 79 and 107 have been cancelled, although Applicants point out that the amendment to the independent claims includes additional features not found in Claims 23, 51, 79 and 107.

Turning now to the Office Action, independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over European Patent 952 513 (White) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,068 (Richter) and the background of the invention. The remaining claims are dependent and were rejected as above, or further in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,820,124 (Clough) or U.S. Patent No. 6,628,413 (Lee). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

According to the above-discussed feature now incorporated in independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85, the system administrator designates a maximum number of printing devices to be supported, and a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number.

In contrast, the applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest this feature. In particular, the cited art is not even seen to disclose the broader features of Claim 23. In fact, the Office Action does not even mention the functionality recited in Claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the applied art can not disclose or suggest the above-noted feature.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

With respect to the remainder of the Office Action, Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95, 98 to 113, 115, 117 and 119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. In general, the Office Action variously asserts that it is unclear whether phrases such as "received information" or "detected printing device" refer to information received in a receiving step, a printing device detected in a detecting step, and so on.

The rejection is traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim language is sufficiently clear, and that those of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand which elements are being referred to in the claims. In fact, it is believed that

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the objected to phrases actually clarify the functionality of the invention. Accordingly, the basis for the instant rejection is not understood. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

The claims have nevertheless been reviewed, with an eye towards improvements in clarity and antecedence, and various amendments have been made with this purpose in mind.

In light of the points made during the interview and the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request same.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Guzniczak
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 59,820

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 129813v1